

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,269	06/27/2002	Ruthie D. Lyle	RPS920020082US1	2687
25259 IBM CORPOR	INER			
3039 CORNW		GHEBRETINSAE, TEMESGHEN		
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195 REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•	2611		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	01/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

				<i>√</i>			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/064,269	LYLE ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Temesghen Ghebretinsae	2611				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence add	ress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutoure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ation. ry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS by statute, cause the application to become ABAND	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this componed (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	·						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed o	n 20 October 2006.					
·		☐ This action is non-final.					
3)□	<i>,</i> —						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are welliam(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	vithdrawn from consideration.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.					
10)[10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)[Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by		-	· ·			
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc	uments have been received. uments have been received in Appli ne priority documents have been rec	cation No	tage			
* S	See the attached detailed Office action for	r a list of the certified copies not rece	eived.				
Attachmen	t(s)	·					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ					
3) 🔲 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

1. It would be of great assistance to the Office if all incoming papers pertaining to a filed application carried the following items:

- 1. Application number (checked for accuracy, including series code and serial no.).
- 2. Group art unit number (copied from most recent Office communication).
- 3. Filing date.
- 4. Name of the examiner who prepared the most recent Office action.
- 5. Title of invention.
- 6. Confirmation number (See MPEP § 503).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gan et al (7,027,418).

Consider claims 1-20. Gan discloses a wireless communications system providing for communication over two or more channels utilizing a communications architecture that calls for hopping from channel to channel during data transmission, the method comprising: scanning (selecting) the channels for interference and identifying channels experiencing interference and not experiencing interference and selecting channels not experiencing interference (the good channels) (see abstract, col.17, lines 11-34); transmitting normal data when hopping to a channel not identified as experiencing interference (on good channels); the scanning step is performed upon the

Application/Control Number: 10/064,269

Art Unit: 2611

commencement of data communication as claimed in claim 2; the scanning step is performed upon each passage of first time period as claimed in claims 3,7; the scanning step is repeated periodically during data transmission as claimed in claims 4,13; the scanning step is performed when the data throughput rate falls below a predefined value as claimed in claims 5,14; the scanning step is performed when requested by the user as claimed in claims 6,15(see col.17, line 35 to lcol.18, line 67); the communication architecture is the standard known as IEEE 802.15.1 and Bluetooth a claimed in claims 9-11(see col.2, lines 27-35).

Gan differs from the claims invention in that he does not transmit only null data when hopping to a channel identified as experiencing interference (bad channels). The reasoning behind it is that to avoid the need to re-transmit packets or data, which are lost due to being transmitted on channels experiencing interference (bad channels). Thus, transmitting null data on channels experiencing interference (bad channels) is an obvious design choice (or functionally equivalent) to not transmitting on channels experiencing interference since on both concepts the data that have been transmitted on the channels that experience interference will be either lost or ignored. (See Gan col.3, lines 16-20)

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Treister (us2002/0116460).

Treister discloses a wireless communications system providing for communication over two or more channels utilizing a communications architecture that calls for hopping from channel to channel during data transmission, the method

Art Unit: 2611

comprising: scanning (selecting) the channels for interference and identifying channels experiencing interference and not experiencing interference and selecting channels not experiencing interference (the good channels) (see abstract and paragraph {0119}); transmitting normal data when hopping to a channel not identified as experiencing interference (on good channels); the scanning step is performed upon the commencement of data communication as claimed in claim 2; the scanning step is performed upon each passage of first time period as claimed in claims 3,7; the scanning step is repeated periodically during data transmission as claimed in claims 4.13; the scanning step is performed when the data throughput rate falls below a predefined value as claimed in claims 5,14; the scanning step is performed when requested by the user as claimed in claims 6,15(see paragraph (0119,0131); the communication architecture is the standard known as IEEE 802.15.1 and Bluetooth a claimed in claims 9-11(see paragraph 0010,0013).

Treister differs from the claims invention in that he does not transmit "only null" data when hopping to a channel identified as experiencing interference (bad channels). Treister avoids transmitting data on channels that have been identified as experiencing interference (bad channels). The reasoning behind it is that to avoid the need to retransmit packets or data, which are lost due to being transmitted on channels experiencing interference (bad channels). Thus, transmitting null data on channels experiencing interference (bad channels) is an obvious design choice (or functionally equivalent) to not transmitting on channels experiencing interference since on both

Application/Control Number: 10/064,269

Art Unit: 2611

concepts the data that have been transmitted on the channels that experience interference will be either lost or ignored. (See paragraph {0019})

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that both Gan and Treister do not "transmit only null packets when hopping to a channel identified as experiencing interference". Examiner agrees with applicant argument and that is why the rejection is based on 103. The motivation/suggestion is described in detail in the office action above and (see Gan col.3, lines 16-20 and Treister paragraph {0019}).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Temesghen Ghebretinsae whose telephone number is

Page 6

571-272-3017. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 to 6. The examiner can also be reached on alternate.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel, can be reached on 571-272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Temesghen Ghebretinsae

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2611

T.Ghebretinsae.

1/5/07.